

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 16, 2007. Claims 1-34 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-34 were rejected. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicant amends Claims 1, 11, 19, and 27. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 25-27. Claims 1-34 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

**SECTION 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-17, 19, and 21-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,751,736 issued to Bowman et al. (hereinafter "Bowman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. § 2131. In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Of the rejected Claims, Claims 1, 11, 19, and 27 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 27 are patentable over *Bowman*. For example, *Bowman* does not appear to disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1. *Bowman* appears to disclose a method for incorporating an encrypted and encoded string containing information about a product for sale on an e-commerce web page (*Bowman*, Abstract). *Bowman* further appears to disclose a method by which an online shopper using the internet can submit a request to purchase a product from a web page, and have that information remain confidential (*Bowman*, col. 2. ll. 30-33). However, *Bowman* does not appear to disclose or even suggest, "generating a hash key using the character string and a private key, wherein the hash key is different for each data packet associated with the secure data transmission" as recited in independent Claim 1 (emphasis added). *Bowman* appears to disclose using the same hash key for encoding and decrypting the

virtual bar code (VBC). For example, *Bowman* states, " In block 433 the SHAD, 431 is used as an encryption key by sequentially XORing (exclusive or Boolean logic operation) it with consecutive segments of the VBC message string, to produce an encrypted VBC string, 435. Accordingly, *Bowman* does not appear to disclose or even suggest the above recited limitation of independent Claim 1. Therefore, *Bowman* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 19 also recites the limitation, "wherein the hash key is different for each data packet associated with the secure data transmission," and independent Claims 11 and 27 recites the limitation, "each of the plurality of character strings correspond to one of the plurality of encrypted data packets." Therefore, for at least for the reasons discussed above, independent Claims 11, 19, and 27 are also patentable.

Claims 2, 4-8, 12-17, 21-26, and 28-34 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 27. Therefore, for at least for the reasons discussed above, Claims 2, 4-8, 12-17, 21-26, and 28-34 are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-17, 19, and 21-34.

#### **SECTION 103 REJECTIONS**


Claims 3, 9, 10, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bowman*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 3, 9, 10, 18, and 20 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 27. Therefore, for at least for the reasons discussed above, Claims 3, 9, 10, 18, and 20 are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of Claims 3, 9, 10, 18, and 20.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
James L. Baudino  
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: February 15, 2008

Correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400  
Tel. 970-898-7244